DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 319 CG 007 302

AUTHOR Worchel, Stephen; Arnold, Susan E.
TITLE The Effects of Censorship and Attractiveness of the Censor on Attitude Change.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Censorship; *Cognitive Processes; College Students; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Psychological Patterns; *Psychological Studies; Reactive Behavior; Research Projects; Sanctions; Thought Processes; *Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

This research studies the effects of censoring a communication, overriding the censor, and the attractiveness of the censor on the potential audience's attitude and desire to hear the communication. The subjects, 144 undergraduate psychology students, were told that a speech which they were to have heard had been censored by a positively, negatively or neutrally evaluated group. Results indicated that regardless of the attractiveness of the censor, censorship caused the audience to change their attitudes toward the position to be advocated by the communication and to increase their desire to hear that communication. The effects are discussed as resulting from the arousal of psychological reactance, which decreased when the censor was overriden and behavioral freedom was restored. Positively evaluated group censors changed subjects' attitudes away from the position advocated by the communication; negative group censors changed their attitudes toward the position of the communication. These results were interpreted as evidence of cognitive balancing. (Author/SES)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 078319

The Effects of Censorship and Attractiveness of the Censor on Attitude Change[1]

Stephen Worchel[2] and Susan E. Arnold

University of North Carolina

Recent research in social psychology has had a great deal to say about how various types of communications and communicators will affect individuals' attitudes. There has been, however, a notable dearth of research on how not being allowed to receive a communication might influence attitudes. The recent furor over the release and subsequent censorship of the Pentagon Papers and over the airing of the reports from the National Commission on Obscenity and Pornography (Weaver, 1970) indicates that the effects of censorship should be investigated. Most research on censorship has dealt with studying the effects of individuals viewing material which has at one time or another been censored (see Medical World News, October 2, 1970). The present paper looks at the relationship between censorship, attractiveness of the censor, and the attitude change which occurs before the individual has the opportunity to view the "censored" material.

CG 007 302

Ashmore, Ramchandra, and Jones (1971) demonstrated that censorship of a communication can have an effect on an individual's attitudes even when he never sees the censored communication. In their study, subjects were told that they were to hear a speech taking either the position that police should be allowed or should not be allowed on college campuses. The experimenter, however, informed subjects that

the dean had censored the speech and that subjects would not be allowed to hear it. A measurement of subjects' attitudes on the police issue showed that subjects changed their attitudes toward the position which was to be advocated in the speech. Ashmore et al. (1971) interpreted their results as supporting reactance theory (Brehm, 1966) predictions as subjects supposedly felt that the censor was threatening their freedom to hold the attitudinal position advocated by the communication. The attitude change was a reflection of their desire to re-establish this freedom.

While a reactance interpretation of the Ashmore et al. (1971) results is viable, so, too, is an interpretation based on Heider's (1958) cognitive balance theory. It is possible that subjects evaluated the dean negatively and that his act of censoring the communication implied his stand against the communication's position on the police issue. Thus, the attitude change toward the position of the speech may simply have resulted from the subjects' desire to take a stand opposite that of an unpopular dean. A decision as to the validity of the reactance and the balance interpretations cannot be made from the Ashmore et al. (1971) study.

Because balance and reactance theories make differential predictions as to the conditions affecting a person's reaction to censorship, it is desirable to attain a better understanding of the psychological processes actuated by censorship. One purpose of the present study is to offer results from which the feasibility of the two explanations may be gauged. To do this a set of conditions was included in which either a positively, neutrally, or negatively evaluated agent censored

a communication. According to reactance theory (Brehm, 1966), reactance should result whenever a behavioral freedom is threatened or eliminated. This should occur regardless of who threatens or eliminates the freedom. If an individual feels that hearing a communication is one of his behavioral freedoms and this freedom is eliminated by a censor, the individual should experience reactance. According to Brehm (1966) this arousal of reactance should lead to a desire to reestablish the freedom and this desire should be manifested in an increase in the motivation to hear the censored communication. Also, if the individual knows the position to be adopted by the communication, censorship of the speech may imply a threat to the individual's freedom to hold that position. The reaction to this threat should be the individual's adopting the censored position as an attempt to regain this attitudinal freedom. These effects should occur whether the censor is an attractive, neutral or unattractive individual.

According to balance theory (Heider, 1958), the act of censorship implies to the individual the position that the censor holds on the issue. If the censor were unattractive, subjects would be motivated to take a position opposite that held by the censor and this would be reflected by attitude change toward the position advocated by the communication. However, if the censor were an attractive individual, balance theory would predict that subjects would be motivated to bring their attitudes in line with his. This would be shown by attitude change away from the position advocated by the censored communication. A neutrally evaluated censor should evoke no attitude change. This same pattern should also be reflected in subjects' desire to hear the

communication: strong desire to hear it following the negative censor but little desire if the censor is positively evaluated.

It is often the case that material which has been censored "leaks" out and becomes available for public consumption. The question to be raised in this case is whether or not the fact that the material was once censored will still have an effect ~~once~~ when the censorship is violated. A second aim of the present research was to study the effects on individuals' attitudes when a censor is overriden by another agent who decides to allow the censored communication to be heard. According to reactance theory (Brehm, 1966), overriding a censor should serve to restore the behavioral freedom to hear the speech and the result should be a decrease in the desire to hear the communication as compared to when the speech was not to be played. No prediction can be made about the effect on attitude though presumably it should return to its pre-censorship position. Balance theory, on the other hand, would make the same predictions for attitude change as it made when there was no overriding the censorship. Regardless of events after the censorship, the censor has revealed his attitude on the issue. Thus, even when the censor is overriden and the speech is to be played, subjects should show attitude change toward the position advocated by the communication when the censor is negatively evaluated and change away from the position of the speech when the censor is positive. Thus, two conditions were included in the present study in which either a positive or negative censor was overriden by an experimenter and subjects were led to expect that they would hear the communication despite the censorship attempt.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 144 male and female introductory psychology students from the University of North Carolina who signed up for an experiment entitled "Communication Processes." Subjects were run in groups of 4. The data from five subjects were deleted because these subjects expressed suspicions about the experimental manipulations.

Procedure

Expect Not to Hear Communication. Four conditions, three experimental and one control, were run in which subjects were led to believe that they would not hear any communication. When subjects in the three experimental conditions arrived at the experimental room the experimenter told them that the study was to have investigated how speaker variables affect the speaker's ability to "get his message across." The experimenter said that she had intended to play a taped speech which took the position that "police should never be allowed on university campuses." Following this tape subjects were to be asked questions concerning the content of the speech and how such speaker variables as tone of voice and pauses affected the speaker's ability to convey his message.

The experimenter then informed the subjects that they would not be able to hear the communication:

> As you know, all studies run at the University of North Carolina are subject to review by a review board and by any other group which wishes to do so. Because the topic of the speech we were using was "police should never be allowed on university campuses," a number of groups elected to review our study.

Subjects in the Positive Censor condition were told:

> Right before we were to run the study, we learned that the YM-YWCA group on campus had strongly opposed our use of the speech and asked that we not be allowed to use it in our study.

In pretesting, the YM-YWCA was found to be a very positively rated organization.

Subjects in the Negative Censor condition were informed that the John Birch Society had reviewed and censored the speech. Pretesting had revealed that the John Birch Society was negatively evaluated by students. In the Neutral Censor condition subjects were informed that the tape recorder had broken and that they would not be able to hear the communication.

Following the revelation that the communication would not be played, subjects in these three conditions were asked to fill out three questionnaires. The first two were presented to subjects as attempts to get information from them that might help in the planning of future studies. One questionnaire asked for subjects' attitudes on a number of issues: one being "police should never be allowed on university campuses." The second questionnaire dealt with the topic of censorship. Subjects were asked to indicate their attitudes on censorship and how much they desired to hear the censored tape. Subjects in the Positive and Negative Censor conditions were also asked why they felt the YM-YWCA (John Birch Society) had censored the speech. The final questionnaire was presented to subjects as being from the "Student Activities Committee." On this questionnaire subjects indicated their feelings towards a number of groups including the YM-YWCA

and John Birch Society and indicated whether or not they felt students should spend more time involved with campus groups.

A No Censor group was included to serve as a control. Subjects in this group were told nothing of a taped speech nor of any censorship. They were simply told that the experimenters were interested in collecting information from them which would be used in planning future studies. These subjects were given questionnaires asking their attitude on the "police on campus" issue and on censorship. They were also given the Student Activities Questionnaire to get their ratings of the YM-YWCA and John Birch Society.

Expect to Hear the Communication. There were three Expect to Hear groups: two experimental and one control.[3] The instructions to the Expect to Hear--Positive Censor and Expect to Hear--Negative Censor groups were the same as those instructions given to the respective Expect Not to Hear groups. They were told that the experiment was to have involved their listening to a speech taking the position, "Police should never be allowed on college campuses." They were given the same story about studies run at the University of North Carolina being open to scrutiny by any group and they were told that the YM-YWCA (Positive Censor) or the John Birch Society (Negative Censor) had censored use of the communication.

However, following this announcement of the censorship the experimenter told the subjects in these Expect to Hear conditions:

> Even though the tape has been censored and I've been requested not to play it, I've decided to play it anyway. So, you will hear the communication.

The subjects were then told that before hearing the speech, they were

to complete three questionnaires which would help in planning future studies and analyzing their data. They were then given the same three questionnaires which had been given to subjects in the Positive and Negative Censor--Expect Not to Hear conditions.

An Expect to Hear--No Censor condition was included to yield data on the simple effects of the anticipation of hearing the speech. Subjects in this condition were told that they would soon hear a tape taking the position that "police should never be allowed on university campuses." They were asked to fill out some questionnaires before hearing the tape and, thus, indicated their attitude on the "police on campus" issue, attitude toward censorship, and their desire to hear the communication. These subjects also completed the Student Activities Questionnaire. After subjects had completed the questionnaires, they were debriefed as to the intent of the study and an attempt was made to get them to reveal any suspicions they had about the procedure.

Design Summary

The design of the study was a 2 X 4 factorial with one missing cell. There were four conditions in which subjects did not expect to hear a communication. In three of these conditions the subjects were told that the communication which they were supposed to have heard had been censored by either a positively (YM-YWCA), negatively (John Birch Society), or neutrally (broken tape recorder) evaluated censor. The position of the communication was to have been "police should never be allowed on university campuses." The fourth Expect Not to Hear condition served to supply a baseline of subjects' attitudes

toward the "police on campus" question as subjects in this condition were told nothing of a communication or of a censor. There were three Expect to Hear conditions. In two of these subjects were told that the "police on campus" speech which they were to have heard had been censored but that they would hear the communication despite this censorship attempt. In one of these conditions, the censor was a positively evaluated group and in the other condition the censor was a negatively evaluated group. The third Expect to Hear group served to yield data on how anticipating hearing the communication might affect attitudes. Subjects in this condition were told nothing about a censorship attempt and were led to believe that they would soon hear a communication taking the position that "police should never be allowed on university campuses." There was no Expect to Hear--Neutral Censor condition run.

All subjects completed questionnaires indicating their attitudes toward censorship, their agreement with the statement that "police should never be allowed on university campuses", and their evaluation of the YM-YWCA and the John Birch Society. Subjects who were told of the existence of the "police on campus" communication rated how much they desired to hear that communication. And subjects who were told that the communication had been censored by a positively or negatively evaluated group indicated their perceptions of the reasons the group might have had for censoring the speech. These measures served as the dependent variables of the study.

Results

The design of the study was a 2 X 4 factorial with one missing cell. Because of the design and because of the nature of the predictions made from balance and reactance theory, main effects and interactions obtained from the overall analysis serve little purpose in understanding reactions to censorship. Thus, only results from planned comparisons will be presented.

Desire to Hear Communication

All subjects, except those in the Expect Not to Hear--No Censor condition, answered the question "How much do you want to hear the tape?" on a twenty-one point scale (1 = Very Much, 21 = Not at All). Reactance theory (Brehm, 1966) would predict that subjects learning of the censorship in the Expect Not to Hear conditions would have the greatest desire to hear the tape. The freedom of these subjects to hear the tape had been eliminated by the censorship and reactance should have been aroused. Subjects in the Expect to Hear conditions involving a positive or negative censor should have experienced reactance when told of the censorship. However, their freedom should have been restored by the experimenter's decision to play the tape and, thus, their desire to hear the tape should have dropped to a pre-censor level. The responses from subjects in the Expect to Hear--No Censor condition should serve as a baseline of desire to hear the tape as they were not told of any censorship. Further, if reactance were the mediating process there should be no significant differences in desire to hear the communication due to the evaluation of the censor.

Balance theory (Heider, 1958), on the other hand, might predict that there should be greater desire to hear the tape when it was censored by a negative censor than when the censorship came from a positive group. In fact, when a positive group censored the tape, there should be less desire to hear the tape than in the Expect to Hear--No Censor condition. These ef-

fects should be found in both the Expect to Hear and Expect Not to Hear conditions.

As can be seen from the means of this question presented in Table 1,

---

Insert Table 1

---

the data supported reactance theory predictions. Subjects in the Expect Not to Hear conditions reported significantly greater desire to hear the tape than subjects in either the two Expect to Hear conditions involving an attempted censorship ($F = 22.43$, $df = 1, 113$, $p < .001$)[4] or in the Expect to Hear--No Censor condition ($F = 25.80$, $df = 1, 113$, $p < .001$). The evaluation of the censor did not affect the results in the Expect Not to Hear conditions as there were no significant difference among these three conditions.

The one finding not anticipated by reactance theory was that subjects in the Expect to Hear--Negative Censor conditions report a greater desire to hear the tape than subjects in the Expect to Hear--Positive Censor cell ($F = 5.20$, $df = 1, 113$, $p < .05$). While this finding is in line with balance theory predictions, the failure to find significant differences between the three Expect Not to Hear censorship conditions does not support balance predictions.

Thus, censorship of the tape, regardless of the censor, increased subjects' desire to hear the communication. When the experimenter decided to overrule the censor and play the tape, subjects' desire to hear the tape decreased. This decrease in desire was greater when the censor was positively rated than when it was negatively evaluated.

Attitude toward Police on Campus

Subjects were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statement: "Police should never be allowed on university campuses"

(1 = Strongly Agree, 21 = Strongly Disagree). If reactance were aroused by the censorship, subjects in the Expect Not to Hear conditions should change their attitudes toward the position to be advocated by the speech and this should occur regardless of the attractiveness of the censor. The restoration of freedom by the experimenter in the Expect to Hear conditions should allow attitudes to return to the pre-censorship state.

Balance theory, on the other hand, might expect no differences between the Expect to Hear and Expect Not to Hear conditions. Instead, predictions would be based on the evaluation of the censor so that a censorship attempt by a positive censor should cause subjects to adopt a position opposite that taken by the communication. When the censor was negatively evaluated, subjects should move their attitude toward the position advocated by the tape.

Insert Table 2

The results shown in Table 2 indicate that support for both theories was obtained. Support for reactance theory can be garnered by the finding that subjects in the censorship cells of the Expect Not to Hear condition adopted attitudes more in line with the censored communication (i.e., more anti-police on campus) than subjects in the Expect Not to Hear--No Censor condition ($F = 5.24$, $df = 1, 132$, p .05). Further, there were no significant differences due to evaluation of the censor in the Expect Not to Hear conditions. The finding that subjects in the Expect Not to Hear--Positive Censor condition were more in agreement with the supposed position of the censored tape than

were subjects in the Expect to Hear--Positive Censor condition ($F = 18.60$, $df = 1, 132$, p .001) also supports reactance theory predictions. There was no significant difference between the attitude of subjects in the Expect Not to Hear--Neutral Censor and Expect Not to Hear--No Censor conditions ($F = 1.70$, $df = 1, 132$, p = ns).

Predictions derivable from balance theory also received support from the attitude data, although this support was confined almost entirely to the Expect to Hear conditions. Subjects in the Expect to Hear--Positive Censor condition actually moved their attitude away from the position of the speech as they showed less agreement with it than subjects in the Expect to Hear--No Censor condition ($F = 6.41$, $df = 1, 132$, p .05). On the other hand, subjects in the Expect to Hear--Negative Censor condition were more in agreement with the position of the tape than were subjects in the Expect to Hear--No Censor condition ($F = 6.49$, $df = 1, 132$, p .05). Problems arise for balance theory as there were no significant differences between the attitudes of subjects in the three censorship cells of the Expect Not to Hear condition. Further, subjects in the Expect Not to Hear--Positive Censor condition showed attitude change toward the position to be advocated by the speech rather than away from it as would be predicted by balance theory.

In general, the results indicated that, regardless of the evaluation of the censor, following censorship subjects changed their attitudes toward the position to be advocated by the speech. However, when the freedom to hear the communication was restored, only subjects falling prey to the negative censor changed their attitude

toward the position of the speech. When the censor was positive, subjects showed attitude change away from the position of the speech and toward the implied position of the censor.

Reasons for Censorship

Subjects in the Expect to Hear and Expect Not to Hear conditions involving either a positive or negative censor were asked to respond to the following statement: "The YM-YWCA (John Birch Society) probably had a good reason for censoring the speech" (1 = Strongly Agree, 21 = Strongly Disagree). The results indicated a significant main effect for evaluation of the censor so that the YM-YWCA was seen as having a better reason for censoring the speech than the John Birch Society ($F = 24.08$, $df = 1, 75$, p .001). There was no effect for the Expect to Hear--Expect Not to Hear variable and the interaction did not approach significance ($F = 0$).

Subjects were also asked to list reasons why they thought the speech had been censored. There were, however, no significant differences between any of the conditions on the number or the content of the listed reasons.

Evaluation of YM-YWCA and John Birch Society

Subjects in all the conditions were asked to indicate their evaluation of a number of groups on a "Student Activities Questionnaire." Among the groups listed on this questionnaire were the YM-YWCA and John Birch Society. Pretesting had shown that students held generally favorable opinions of the YM-YWCA and were negatively inclined toward the John Birch Society. As can be seen from the results

presented in Table 3, the YM-YWCA was rated positively while the John Birch Society was rated negatively. This supports the pretesting findings and indicates that the YM-YWCA was viewed as a positive censor and the John Birch Society did serve as a negative censor.

Insert Table 3

There were no significant differences between any of the groups in their rating of the John Birch Society. However, subjects in the Expect Not to Hear--Positive Censor condition rated the YM-YWCA significantly lower than did subjects in the other conditions ($F = 21.25$, $df = 1, 132$, p .001).

Discussion

The results in the Expect Not to Hear conditions suggest that censorship may arouse reactance and this reactance will result in an increased desire to hear the censored communication. As would be expected if reactance were aroused by censorship, it seems to make little difference whether the censor is positively, negatively, or neutrally rated. This latter finding suggests that a simple balance theory (Heider, 1958) explanation could not account for the results following censorship. Balance theory would anticipate increased desire to hear the communication only when the censor was negatively rated.

The finding that censorship by either a positively or negatively evaluated group leads to attitude change in the direction which was to have been advocated by the communication also supports reactance theory. Supposedly, the act of censoring a speech which takes a certain

position implies a threat to the freedom of the potential audience to hold that position on the issue. Adopting the censored position restores the freedom to hold that attitude. The results on attitude change also argue against a balance theory interpretation of censorship. Balance theory could not have anticipated that there would be attitude change toward the position of the censored speech in the Expect Not to Hear--Positive Censor condition or that there would be no difference between the attitudes of subjects in this condition and the attitude of subjects in the Expect Not to Hear--Negative Censor condition.

The failure to find significant attitude change toward the speech's position when the censorship ~~is~~ was the function of a mechanical failure may be due to the fact that the mechanical failure did not have the same implications for attitudinal freedom as did intentional censorship by a group. While it is difficult to interpret the results from the Neutral Censor condition since they were not significantly different from either the No Censor condition or the Positive or Negative Censor conditions, the possibility suggests itself that the effects of censorship on attitude and desire to hear a communication may be separated. In other words, it may be possible to censor a speech and increase the audience's desire to hear it without affecting their attitude.

The decrease in liking for the YM-YWCA when they censored the speech in the Expect Not to Hear condition is in line with Worchel's (1971) findings that the arousal of reactance may result in aggression directed toward the threatening agent. Worchel (1971) showed that a thwarting involving an elimination of behavioral freedom resulted in

greater aggression than a thwarting involving violation of expectancy or simple frustration. The fact that the John Birch Society was not rated less favorably in the Expect Not to Hear--Negative Censor condition cannot be explained by reactance theory although it may simply have been due to a ceiling effect since the John Birch Society was already disliked. It should, however, be pointed out that the decrease in liking for the censor may be explained by frustration-aggression theory (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939).

Thus the results from the Expect Not to Hear conditions indicate that censorship of a communication may increase the desire of the potential audience to hear the speech and they may also adopt the position which was to be advocated by the speech. The censor may also become more negatively evaluated by the audience. The pattern of results suggests that these effects are mainly due to the arousal of reactance by the act of censorship and not simply due to a balancing process. These findings and conclusion support Ashmore et al. (1971) position that censorship arouses reactance.

There were, however, a number of instances of cognitive balancing. First, in the Expect Not to Hear conditions there was less, though not significantly less, desire to hear the communication and attitude change toward the position of the speech in the Positive Censor condition than in the Negative Censor cell. Second, there was greater desire in the Expect to Hear conditions to hear the communication that was censored by the negative censor as opposed to that censored by the positive censor. This is in line with balance theory as subjects seemed willing to comply with the positively rated group but

not with the negatively rated John Birch Society. Third, the finding that subjects in the Negative Censor condition adopted the position of the communication while those in the Positive Censor condition adopted the opposite position supports balance theory. By adopting the position of the speech, subjects in the Negative Censor condition were taking the position opposite that supposedly held by the John Birch Society. Subjects in the Positive Censor condition were adopting the position supposedly held by the YM-YWCA and opposite that advocated by the speech. Thus, it would seem that the act of censorship "cues" the audience as to the position held by the censor and may initiate attempts on the part of the audience to bring their attitudes into balance with their evaluation of the censor.

It seems that, while censorship may initiate attempts at cognitive balancing, these attempts may be obliterated by the individual's efforts to restore his behavioral and attitudinal freedom. Balance and reactance effects seem to work in the same direction when the censor is negatively evaluated. Here, balance can be accomplished and freedom can be restored when the individual adopts a position opposite that of the censor. However, when the censor is positive, balance and reactance forces work in opposite directions. Balance calls for agreement with the censor and reactance theory predicts disagreement. There is, however, the potential that reactance and balance effects would point in a similar direction even with an originally positive censor. If censoring the communication were to drastically lower the individual's opinion of the positive censor,

then balancing work would become congruent with attempts at restoration of freedom. There was some indication in the present study that the censor did decrease in attractiveness but this decrease still did not make him appear negative to the subject.

It is interesting to note that the effects of censorship on attitude and desire to hear the communication do not seem to be mediated by the reasons behind the censorship which the audience imputes. Subjects generally reported that they felt the YM-YWCA probably had good reason to censor the communication. However, in the Expect Not to Hear condition, the censorship still increased subjects' desire to hear the communication and created attitude change toward the position to be advocated by the speech. Thus, even a censor who is seen as having good reasons for censoring a communication may actually force the audience closer to the position which he opposes.

One important point needs to be made here. In the Ashmore et al. (1971) study and in this one, the subject was aware that he was being prevented from hearing a communication. In order for reactance to occur, the individual must feel that hearing the communication is one of his "free behaviors" and that this freedom is being eliminated by the censorship. Supposedly the censorship of a communication which the individual did not feel he was free to hear would not arouse reactance. However, balancing may occur in this situation as the censorship would still serve to imply the censor's position on the issue.

The results of this study have implications for attitude change

and censorship research. First, research on attitude change has demonstrated that it is difficult to develop a communication which will be effective in changing subjects' attitudes--especially very extreme attitudes. Subjects tend to counterargue with the communication (Hass and Linder, in press), fail to attend to or remember points from the communication (Levine and Murphy, 1943), or merely reject the communication (Sherif and Hovland, 1961). The implications of the present study are that it may not be necessary to communicate with an audience in order to change their attitudes in the desired direction. If the audience holds position X, simply telling them that a communication advocating position Y has been censored may be sufficient to cause them to change their attitude toward Y. The present study did not deal with extreme attitudes and further research is necessary to determine whether extreme attitudes can be affected by censorship. What does seem evident is that censorship can affect attitudes regardless of the attractiveness of the censor and the position advocated by the communication which is censored (Ashmore et al., 1971).

Second, research on censorship has generally focused on the effects that exposure to censored material might have on individuals' behavior and attitudes (see Medical World News, October 2, 1970). The question that has been asked is whether or not giving people access to certain types of information might have adverse effects on their attitudes or behavior. The present study suggests that another question needs to be examined: what might be the effects of not allowing a person to be exposed to information of whose existence he is aware?

References

Ashmore, R.D., Ramchandra, V. and Jones, R.A. Censorship as an attitude change induction. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association Convention, April, 1971.

Brehm, J.W. A theory of psychological reactance. New York: Academic Press, 1966.

Dollard, J., Doob, L.W., Miller, N.E., Mowrer, O.H., and Sears, R.R. Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.

Hass, R.G. and Linder, D.E. Counterargument availability and the effects of message structure on persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, in press.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Levine, J.M. and Murphy, G. The learning and forgetting of controversial material. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 507-517.

Set, censorship, and society's psyche. Medical World News, October 2, 1970.

Sherif, M. and Hovland, C.I. Social judgement: Assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Weaver, W. Nixon repudiates obscenity report as morally void. The New York Times, October 25, 1970, 120, Pp. 1 and 71.

Worchel, S. The effect of simple frustration, violated expectancy and reactance on the instigation to aggression. Dissertation, Duke University, 1971.

Footnotes

[1]The authors would like to express their thanks to Robert Frey and Allan Lind for their help in analyzing the data. Thanks also are expressed to Chester Insko, Virginia Andreoli and John Schopler for their helpful comments on the manuscript and to the Organizational Research Group for their insightful suggestions about the design of the study.

[2]Requests for reprints should be sent to Stephen Worchel, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

[3]The Expect to Hear--Neutral Censor condition was not run, as it was felt that results from this condition would add little to the understanding of the relationship between censorship and attitude change.

[4]All levels of significance are reported for two-tailed tests.

Table 1

Mean Responses on Desire to Hear the Communication

	Positive Censor	Negative Censor	Neutral Censor	No Censor
Expect Not to Hear	(N=21) 4.33* SD=2.50	(N=19) 3.32 SD=2.73	(N=21) 4.71 SD=3.84	Question Not Asked
Expect to Hear	(N=20) 8.90 SD=3.84	(N=18) 6.33 SD=3.64	Condition Not Run	(N=20) 8.80 SD=4.65

*Subjects asked: "How much do you want to hear the tape?"

1 = Very Much, 21 = Not at all

Table 2

Means of Subjects' Attitudes on "Police on Campuses" Issue

	Positive Censor	Negative Censor	Neutral Censor	No Censor
Expect Not To Hear	(N=21) 6.90* SD=5.17	(N=19) 5.53 SD=4.61	(N=21) 7.48 SD=4.13	(N=19) 9.32 SD=4.23
Expect to Hear	(N=20) 12.67 SD=4.86	(N=18) 5.33 SD=3.73	Condition Not Run	(N=20) 9.10 SD=4.24

*"Police should never be allowed on university campuses."

1 = Strongly Agree, 21 = Strongly Disagree

Table 3

Subjects' Ratings of John Birch Society and YM-YWCA

1. John Birch Society

1 = Very Positive 10 = Very Negative

	Positive Censor	Negative Censor	Neutral Censor	No Censor
Expect Not to Hear	7.86 SD=1.46	8.26 SD=1.85	8.10 SD=1.41	7.84 SD=2.04
Expect to Hear	8.33 SD=1.28	7.50 SD=1.42	Condition Not Run	7.35 SD=2.28

2. YM-YWCA

1 = Very Positive 10 = Very Negative

	Positive Censor	Negative Censor	Neutral Censor	No Censor
Expect Not to Hear	4.43 SD=1.75	2.42 SD=1.07	3.14 SD=1.42	2.68 SD=1.20
Expect to Hear	3.00 SD=1.52	3.39 SD=1.38	Condition Not Run	2.80 SD=1.28